REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed April 27, 2009.
Claims 12-24 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claims 14, 15,
21, and 22, leaving pending in the application claims 12-24. Applicant submits that no new
matter has been introduced by virtue of these amendments. Reconsideration of the rejected
claims is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Specification

The Specification has been amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error
introduced in the Preliminary Amendment dated October 29, 2003. In particular, the
Specification has been amended to state that the present application is a <u>continuation</u> of U.S.
Patent Application No. 09/314,614 (rather than a divisional). No new matter is added.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection of Claims 14, 15, and 22

Claims 14, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as
being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which
Applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 14 and 15, the Office Action states: "the limitations
'coupling the plurality of agency base units are coupled to an agency device,' and 'coupling the
plurality of agency base units are couple to an HTTP server' do not make grammatical sense."
(Office Action: pg. 3). Claims 14 and 15 have been amended to correct these grammatical
errors.

With respect to claim 22, the Office Action states:

> Claim 22 recites the limitations "an agency" and "a message passing interface"
> in line 2. Because both of these terms are declared in claim 21, it is unclear to the examiner
> whether the same agency and message passing interface are desired to be claimed in claim 22, or
> another agency and message passing interface. Clarification is required.
> (Office Action: pg. 3).

Claim 22 has been amended to address this antecedent basis issue.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims 12-14, 21, and 22

Claims 12-14, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,027, hereinafter "Cambron") in view of Sudhakaran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,712, hereinafter "Sudhakaran") and Luther et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,370, hereinafter "Luther"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant's independent claim 12 recites, in part:

receiving, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier;

executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and

updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality.

Applicants submit that at least the foregoing features of independent claim 12 are not taught or suggested by Cambron, Sudhakaran, or Luther, considered individually or in combination. The Office Action concedes that the "receiving…," "executing…," and "updating…" features of claim 12 quoted above are not shown by Cambron or Sudhakaran. (Office Action: pgs. 4-6). However, the Office Action asserts that these features are shown by Luther at column 6, line 53 to column 7, line 4. (Office Action: pg. 7). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Luther is directed to "an arrangement for extracting selectable fields of text data from calendar files, electronic mail files and other structured data files, and feeding the extracted data to a text-to-speech converter so that the selected fields can be spoken." (Luther: col. 1, lines 46-50). The section of Luther cited by the Office Action states:

Referring to FIG. 6, there is illustrated calendar format file 60. Calendar format file 60 consists of hierarchical fields which are interrelated by date, time and appointment. The type of calendar format file may differ depending on the type of software utilized. For example, the calendar format illustrated in FIG. 6 is published by Microsoft.

Each calendar format file 60 includes calendar date 64, time 65 and appointment information 67. A personal computer user stores the calendar format file in memory,

Appl. No. 10/697,606
Amdt. dated July 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 27, 2009

PATENT

such as on the network file server 21 or local hard disk 31, and upon request can retrieve the

information for a desired date and time.

(Luther: col. 6, line 53 – col. 7, line 4).

As can be seen, the cited section of Luther describes a "calendar format file," such as file 60 shown in FIG. 6 of Luther. The calendar format file includes data fields for data, time, and appointment information. The calendar format file can be stored in a memory component such as a network file server or local hard disk, and can be retrieved when a user requests calendar information regarding a particular date and time.

Contrary to the Office Action, Applicants submit that the cited section of Luther fails teach anything about "receiving, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier," "executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request," and "updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality" as recited in claim 12. For example, Applicant fails to perceive (and the Office Action fails to explain) how the calendar format file described in Luther teaches anything about an agent card mounted in an agency base unit, let alone the act of receiving, over a network, a request at such an agent card to execute a response functionality of the agent card, where the request includes an identifier of the agent card. As best understood, these features are completely absent in the cited section of Luther.

Further, since the cited section of Luther fails to make any reference to the recited agent card or the recited request of claim 12, the cited section necessarily fails to teach or suggest executing the response functionality of the agent card in response to the request. Yet further, since the cited section of Luther fails to make any reference to the recited agent card or the "executing…" feature of claim 12, the cited section necessarily fails to teach or suggest updating the state for response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that independent claim 12 is not rendered obvious by Cambron, Sudhakaran, and/or Luther, and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 14, 21, and 22 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 12, and are thus allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 12, and others.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections of Claims 15-20, 23, and 24

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Land et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,805, hereinafter "Land"). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Ransom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,990,395, hereinafter "Ransom"). Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Oatman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,157, hereinafter "Oatman"). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Takatsuki et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0075599, hereinafter "Takatsuki"). Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron in view of Sudhakaran, Luther and Land. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 24 recites features that are substantially similar to independent claim 12, which is not rendered obvious by Cambron, Sudhakaran, and Luther as discussed above. Land does not provide any teaching that would remedy the deficiencies of Cambron, Sudhakaran, and Luther in this regard. Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 12, and others.

Claims 15-20 and 23 depend from independent claim 12, which is not rendered obvious by Cambron, Sudhakaran, and Luther as discussed above. The other cited references do not provide any teaching that would remedy the deficiencies of Cambron, Sudhakaran, and

Appl. No. 10/697,606
Amdt. dated July 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 27, 2009

PATENT

Luther in this regard. Accordingly, claims 15-20 and 23 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 12, and others.

Amendments to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the Specification as filed and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew J. Lee/

Andrew J. Lee
Reg. No. 60,371

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 858-350-6100
Fax: 415-576-0300
A2L:m4g
62056058 v1